के बाद रिपेअर होता है। इस काम में कोई डिले नहीं हुआ है।

श्रीमती मालती शर्मा: मान्यवर, मेरे पास जानकारी है कि माननीय मंत्री जी के उत्तर दिए जाने के समय तक वहां मलबा वगैरा पड़ा हुआ है। कल रात तक ही वह काम समाप्त कर चुके हैं। इसी के साथ-साथ वहां खाली मकान हैं जिन्हें ठेकेदार अपने इस्तेमाल में लेते हैं। तो यह सब काम समाप्त करने में ठेकेदारों को जो इस तरह की सुविधा दी जाती है, इस बारे में माननीय मंत्री जी विचार करेंगे?

श्री जगमोहन: सर, उस में इंस्ट्रक्शंस आलरेडी इश्यू हो चुके हैं। सर, जिस मकान की लाइफ खत्म हो चुकी हो और खाली हो, उस को डिमॉलिश कर देना चाहिए। लेकिन डिमॉलिश करने के लिए कुछ फॉर्मलिटीज पूरी करनी पड़ती हैं—टेंडर कॉल करने पड़ते हैं, मकान तोड़ना पड़ता है। Instructions have already been issued. कुछ मकान जो खाली हैं, वह तोड़े भी गए हैं।

MR.CHAIRMAN: Question No. 43.

Clearance of Revised Script of Film 'Water'

*43. SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that he himself had cleared the revised script of film 'Water';

(b) if so, whether the suspension of permission for shooting of the film on the basis of this script can be construed as the breach of the fundamental right of freedom of expression;

(c) if so, whether Government have taken it up with the Home Ministry for rectifying the situation;

(d) if so, the response thereto; and

(e) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DISINVESTMENT (SHRI ARUN JAITELY): (a) to (e) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) to (e) The proposal for grant of permission for shooting the film "Water" by M/s Flagship International Limited from Canada was approved by this Ministry according to procedure prescribed for shooting in India, either wholly

or partly by foreigners, which is laid down in the Visa Manual of the Ministry of External Affairs. Permission was granted to the company by letter of 6th January 2000 after due consultation with Ministry of Home Affairs.

The State Government of Uttar Pradesh conveyed that there were protests by organizations and persons in Varanasi about the content of the script and suggested re-examination of the script by the Govt. of India. As per the procedure prescribed for shooting of feature films in India by foreigners, any material deviations in the approved script require prior permission of this Ministry. Accordingly, Ms. Deepa Mehta approached the Ministry for approval of a revised version of the script with certain amendments/deletions and dialogues in Hindi. Approval of the Government was accorded to the amended version on 2.2.2000. Shooting was resumed on 5th February but due to continued demonstrations by several organizations and groups of persons causing a law and order problem in the city, the District Administration ordered stoppage of shooting for 15 days under Section 144 of Cr. PC by their order of 7th February, 2000.

Permission is granted by this Ministry to the applicant subject to a condition that shooting on locations would be with the permission of respective controlling authorities. As the permission to shoot in Varanasi is subject to the District Administration's permission, this Ministry has not approached the Home Ministry in this regard.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, it is very unfortunate that even after the clearance of the script of Water by the Government of India, and even though the Minister has gone elaborately into detailing the facts leading to the final disruption of the shooting of the film, the fact remains that the film could not be shot.

My first supplementary is, in this country, there are certain laws which detail as to what are the technical requirements for the shooting of a film. If a particular director or a production team has complied with all the processes and the Government of India has also agreed that all technical parameters have been fulfilled, and still there is cultural policing by a section of the people, how the right of that particular director or that production team can be ensured? Is there any lacuna here? I would like to know the position. Sir, I would like to know whether the Central Government has no moral responsibility to see what happens to the production of the film after it is cleared by it. Sir, I do not want to go into the contents of the film. That is not the contention. But, what is the

legal position? Is it not the responsibility of the Central Government to ensure that the film really is shot?

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, the question seems to be more on a matter of opinion than on a matter of fact. I have already given the details of the facts with regard to the shooting of this particular film. As far as the Central Government is concerned, the film producer had approached us with a changed script. Concurrence was granted to that. After that, there was a protest by a section of the people of Varanasi. But, the concurrence was subject to the fact that permission from the local authorities had to be obtained. Such permission was taken in the first instance. And when there was tension on account of the shooting of the film in the city, Section 144 was imposed and the shooting of the film was suspended for a period of fifteen days. As far as the Government of India is concerned, our obligation comes in when we have to clear the script. Subsequently, after production, the film has to come back to us again for clearance. Thereafter, it has to go to the Censor Board, if it is to be screened within India. And if it is to be screened outside India, it has to be cleared by all our Missions abroad.

The responsibility of providing protection when there are protests is of the local administration. As far as the question is concerned as to what is to be done, there have been several cases in the past where the protestors also have sought to exercise their freedom of expression by resorting to protests. And we have stated categorically that all such cases of violence or any form of intimidation must be avoided.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, I understand the predicament of the Minister. Therefore, I am not going into the facts as to what has happened and all that. I do not want to embarrass him further. But I draw your attention to the last sentence of the written statement of the hon. Minister which says as the permission to shoot in Varanasi is subject to the District Administration's permission, this Ministry has not approached the Home Ministry in this regard. Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the threat issued by the Central Government, by sending a central team under article 355 when there was some political violence in West Bengal. Subsequently, the Central Government could not sustain its case. But the point is, under the laws of the land, if the fundamental right for a particular activity is being encroached upon, is there no provision within the Constitution whereby the Central Government will prevail upon and rectify the situation? What is the response? How many days have we been through after this horrible incident? What is the

[Shri Nilotpal Basu]

response of the Home Ministry? I have raised this point in my question. What is the response from the Home Ministry to the I & B Ministry? There is no response. Is the Government mum on that? Or don't they have the time to decide on this issue? What will be the response of the Government of India through the Home Ministry?

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, it is more a comment than a question. But I will respond to what the hon. Member says. (*Interruptions*). Please wait for the response. When certain incidents were reported to the Central Government on the 30th and 31st of January this year, the Home Ministry had advised the State of Uttar Pradesh that police protection must be given. After the incident of the 7th, since the film-maker decided to pull out of Varanasi, there was nothing more that the Government could do in the context of Varanasi.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Mr. Chairman, I am on a question of fact. It is reported here in the Press that when all this agitation took place in Varanasi, the District Magistrate rushed to the Home Secretary of Uttar Pradesh who, in consultation with the Uttar Pradesh Government and the Information and Broadcasting Ministry, swiftly clamped down on the shooting. I would like to know if this is correct. Did the State Government, in any form, get in touch with you, Mr. Minister, or with your Ministry? That is point No. 1. Point No. 2 is, what steps have you taken to protect your own position and to ensure that Article 19 which is still part of the Constitution that we have and which provides for freedom of expression is not violated before a review, of course.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: The Government of U.P. had written to us on the 31st of January this year that there were certain objections and protests which were raised in Varanasi with regard to the script on the 2nd of February. The Ministry met the people who were objecting against the script and also met the persons concerned with the production of the film. There was an objection with regard to some parts of the film and sentences used therein. The producer of the film, the director of the film, suo motu gave a representation wanting to delete certain portions and alter the script. Thereafter, examining the script, it was cleared and pursuant to the response from the State of U.P. Thereafter, the producer went back and attempted to shoot the film. As far as the question of maintenance of law and order is concerned, it is for the State Government and the local administration to ensure that law and order is maintained when such a film is being shot.

SHRIMATI SHABANA AZMI: Sir, I have read and heard the hon. Minister with some degree of dismay. As somebody who was directly involved, I wish to state here that this whole law and order problem was a pure fabrication. At one point of time, we were told that 10,000 protestors were there to hold up the shooting. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: At least, in the Rajya Sabha, let her speak. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI SHABANA AZMI: Sir, it was pure fabrication. Sir, through you, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he is aware that during the shooting of Ismail Merchant's film 'Deceiver', similar protests had been held at the local level. At that time, the then Secretary of Information and Broadcasting flew down to Rajasthan and said very clearly to the State Government that since the Centre had cleared the script in this case, it was binding on the State Government to see that the shooting was ensured. Because of such clear directives, the shooting had proceeded. Now, in this case, I find it very strange that the unit of 'Water' were not the people who were creating the law and order problem. They were victims of it. How can you penalise the victims instead of restraining those people who were supposedly creating the law and order problem? If it is so, we have to then presume that the writ of the Central Government is not binding on the State Government. I find it unacceptable that the Minister should say that we have given this clearance. It is purely a violation of article 19 of the Constitution of India. What has the Minister to say about that? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: It is a statement of her perception.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: It is a fact.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, if the hon. Member had concentrated on my first reply she would not have raised this question. When the State of U.P. got in touch with us, we had sent a communication to them on 2nd February, 2000 with regard to the revised script which was cleared by us. But then there have been serveral cases in the past. I am sure the hon. Member, both as hon. Member of this House and as an experienced cinema person, is aware of the fact that there have in the past also been local protest in relation to several incidents which had taken place when films were being shot and some people had protested. Our stand which we have very clearly stated is that even if you have a right to protest, you have no right to indulge in violence or cause any damage to the sets. In fact, I have gone through the record which is with me where she

had also suffered in similar instances in West Bengal in 1991 in cinemas which she had acted. In fact, that would have been a better illustration if she had given instead of the Rajasthan case.

SHRIMATI SHABANA AZMI : Sir, this is not true because the shooting of the film was allowed. It was not disrupted. *(Interruptions)* This is extremely unfortunate...*(Interruptions)* The Minister cannot escape responsibility like that. *(Interruptions)* The shooting was allowed. We completed that shooting. *(Interruptions)* How can he refer to the West Bengal incident here? This is completely wrong. *(Interruptions)*

श्रीमती सरला महेश्वरी: बोलने क्यों नहीं देते आप इनको? ...(व्यवधान)... सच्चाई को बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकते आप। ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI JIBON ROY: The Central Government have cleared the script in this case. (*Interruptions*) They were allowed to shoot... (*Interruptions*) The script was cleared by the Central Government. (*Interruptions*)

श्री रामदास अग्रवाल: अभी 'हे राम' पर पत्थर फैंके गए ...(व्यवधान)... 'हे राम' पर पत्थर फैंके गए और कांग्रेस के कार्यकर्ता थे उसमें। ...(व्यवधान)...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Venkaiah Naidu.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, when the Members are being allowed to put questions, there is interruption, demonstration and protest here. That being the case, you can understand the situation when the feeling of the people are hurt. I am not going into that. The issue is very simple. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JIBON ROY: I am saying that it was done by the Hindu fanatics, not the people.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU : In that case, if I say Communist fanatics, will you accept it? What is this? (*Interruptions*) Mr. Jibon Roy, please hold yourself. You will be embarassed if I take examples. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jibon Roy, let him complete his question. He has a right to put his question.

Please don't interrupt him now. You have done enough.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: What about Shabana's speech? He interruped her.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: I did not interrupt her. Though she is an interested party in this, I have not interruped. My point is very simple. It is a

commercial proposition. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether it is a commercial proposition or something like a charitable social reform because I am told, as per the answer ...*(Interruptions)*... How much interest they are taking in a foreign film? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI SARLA MAHESHWARI: I have a right.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Of course, you have a right. They are more concerned about a foreigner, I am concerned about Indians.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Smt. Maheshwari is replying on behalf of the Minister.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, what is the remedy left to the people whose sentiments have been hurt, time and again, whether it be this community or that community, this region or that region, anybody whose feelings are hurt by foreign producers? ...*(Interruptions)*...Sir, earlier also there were such instances. I can give you instances, right from the days of Jawaharlal Nehruji. About fourteen films have either been banned or stopped from being shot in this country. These fourteen films include both Indian and foreign films. ...*(Interruptions)*... What is this? Why are you so impatient? Why are you so concerned about a Canadian producer? I am concerned about the Indian people. ...*(Interruptions)*... Yes, Hindus, the people of Varanasi, Brahmins, widows. I am concerned about all these people. Don't have a concern for the Canadians. You are arguing a foreigner's case. Don't make allegations. I am concerned about Hindus. I am concerned about Muslims. I am concerned about widows. I am concerned about Brahmins. They have been insulted. I am concerned about every community, including Brahmins. You are concerned only about Canadians. Don't make allegations.

SHRI JIBON ROY: You are encouraging monsters...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him speak.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: I would like to know from the Minister whether he is aware of the fact that around 13 films right from "Nine steps to Rama", "City of Joy", "Lu Nvi Calcutta", "Me Nathu Ram Godse", were stopped from being shot or stopped even later on because of local protests. If so, what are the guidelines of the Ministry to shoot defamatory films which affect the sentiments of the people? ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, this sort of dictatorship should not be allowed. I am very sure and I will be the last man to budge on this sort of dictatorship in this House. This is very fascist. This shows a fascist mentality. We will not accept it. They cannot hurt the feelings of the Indian people.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, the hon. Member has sought to know that in case some sections of the people are protesting against any fact contained in a

film, what are the remedies left to them. Sir, there are remedies. As far as granting of permission to a foreign film is concerned, we have a liaison officer who is present throughout when the film is shot. Even after the film is cleared, in the first instance, the producer has to come with the entire film to ask us for permission for screening it in India. We either clear it ourselves, that is, in the Ministry, or, if it is screened outside India, we depute one of the officers from our missions outside India to clear it. If there is anything objectionable which hurts the image of India or a section of its people, it is taken care of. At that stage, if the film is to be screened in India, it has to go through the Censor Board for clearance where there are detailed guidelines to see if the religious sentiments of a section of the people are hurt. The Censor Board would take care of it. So, we have a full mechanism. Anybody who is protesting — he is entitled to protest — must write to us in this regard. We will certainly take their views into consideration when we finally clear it.

SHRI MRINAL SEN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am not here to hold a brief for a film which I have not seen, which has not been made, which has not been allowed to be made. Now, when the Minister, as well as the hon. Member, Mr. Venkaiah Naidu, said "The sentiments are hurt..", well, I feel, it is a bit of rhetoric they are talking about. I can tell you a story. I am a film maker in 1980, I have made films. In 1980, a group of film makers went to a village in India,—in Bengal to be very precise,—to recreate the famine that took place in 1943 during the colonial regime; in one year, millions of people just starved and dropped dead, and this was what was to be recreated in my film in 1980. It was a film within a film. In the beginning, the villagers were very cooperative, but, after some time, in the middle of the production, the leaders of the village, whose forefathers had a very, very important role to play in the mechinations of the famine in 1943, mobilised themselves and finally, what happened was, they, together with their headless lackeys, rose in revolt and, ultimately, it was not possible for the unit to make the film there. They had to leave this film, and they had to leave this place. They had to leave this place and they would have possibly shot it in a studio in Calcutta. That is what I am talking about. I made the film in 1980. And this is what has been happening. It is not just that the sentiment is hurt. It is something of this kind that happened there. Maybe, I do not know this script. Something of this kind did happen. I mean, they were scared that something would be told there. I, as a Bengali, hang my head in shame that we, for the last 20—30 years, did not do anything about the widows living in Kashi and Vrindavan. We have not done anything. I don't think any social scientist has done research work on the widows, on the Bengali

widows, living in Kashi and Vrindavan. It is a shame. I feel ashamed of it as a Bengali. But when I was told that a film like this would be made, I felt, "Why didn't I do it?" I envied Deepa Mehta. I don't know what kind of film she will be making, but this is what I am talking about. I tell you what happened in Calcutta, since Calcutta has been mentioned, I mean, the 'City of Joy'. I was also there. It is true that the film was allowed to be made. They made the whole film, but a lot of noises were made there. A lot of noises were made there, and I asked the Director Rollen Jofen, "How could you operate your brain reasonably well in a situation like this?" So, this is what has been happening, and this might have happened in Varanasi also. But the moment I heard that the film would be made elsewhere, I lost interest in the whole thing. This has happened when you talk about a widow against the backdrop of Kashi; that is something tremendous. I thought that it would have the flavour of an epic. Anyway, when it is closed, when it is not allowed to be shot there, and they have to shoot elsewhere; maybe, a lot of things will not be there which, possibly, the Director wanted to have in the film. Therefore, something must be done about it. That is what I wanted to say. Just saying that the sentiment of the people is hurt is not enough. We have to make probe into the whole thing and decide, and do the things. And this is what has to be done. I am not very happy about what happened in Calcutta. I must say I am not happy, and they made a mistake. Possibly, the State Government also made a mistake, and the cases are, more or less, the same. There also, the permission was given by the State Government, by the Central Government, and, in the State, it is perhaps, the convention; it is not under the law that the Central Government also asks the State Government if they have any objection. The State Government also, after a lot of things,—I do not know what happened—possibly gave the permission. They said, "There is no objection." ...*(Interruptions)* But then, what happened there was...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Put a question. Please put a question to the Minister. You have expressed your views. Any question to the Minister?

SHRI MRINAL SEN: My question is: Could he do anything about that? Suppose, I want to make a film. If I want to make a film, how is it that the local people, the goons will take the film and if they do something like this, what will the Government do? What will the State Government and the Central Government be doing? That is my question.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: I have heard Shri Sen's opinions at length. I certainly respect his opinion. I will only reiterate what I had stated earlier. Even when

there were protests, the Central Government had been reiterating that keeping those factors into consideration, when it comes back to us for an ultimate clearance, we will make sure, in accordance with the guidelines, that nothing happens which either hurts the religious sensitivities of the people, or, displays anything which hurts India's image inside, or, abroad. It is the responsibility of the Government to ensure that. And this is what we have been repeatedly reiterating. I have been hoping that in view of this, if the protestors claim that they have a right to protest, they would also see this point.

SMT. JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, I am happy to hear what the hon. Minister said about the sensibilities and the hurt sentiments of the people. He also said that it will be the responsibility of the Government to ensure that sentiments are not hurt. Sir, in another film called, Hey Ram, the image of Mahatma Gandhi, the father of the nation, is very badly hurt. Now, we have not been talking about this film. Even before the film, Water, was made, the people had protested, and the district administration claimed that there were thousands of people. It is not like that. We heard from other newspaper reports that there were hardly 50 or 100 people. On the other hand, Hey Ram,—this is a film, which has been made and which I have seen. And nothing could be more calculated to lower the image of Mahatma Gandhi, or, one section of the community, the Muslims of India. When we came out, we felt as if the Muslims are not good people and they are not part of India. What are you going to do about a film like that? There have been protests all over the country. You have allowed a film like that to be screened. It is being screened all over the country. Is not the Government responsible? Are not the guidelines being violated in this regard? * What are you going to do about this thing? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: You cannot make a comment like that. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I agree with you. (*Interruptions*) Remarks against the Chief Minister would not go on record. (*Interruptions*)

SMT. JAYANTHI NATARAJAN:* Sir, I am very sorry. (*Interruptions*) Sir, "Chief Minister" is not an unparliamentary word. *(Interruptions)*. Why should we strike it out? (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is not present here. (*Interruptions*)

SMT. JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: The Director of the film, 'Water', Deepa Mehta, is also not present here. (*Interruptions*)

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: Sir, all references to the Chief Minister should be withdrawn. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no argument here. (Interruptions) Now, Mr. Minister. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: The hon. Member now wants to know the response of the Central Government to a film in which the legendary personality of India, according to her, or, her comments, has been shown in a bad light. It is a film which is produced by an Indian company. In cases of this kind, there is a fundamental difference. *(Interruptions)* I only hope that the hon. member, before expressing her further opinion, would listen to me. There is a fundamental difference. When a foreign production house wants to produce a film, they require a prior clearance. An Indian producer does not require any prior clearance. After the production of the film, the Indian producer has to go to the Censor Board for a clearance. The Censor Board has very clear guidelines and the Censor Board applies those guidelines. In case the Censor Board goes worng, as the hon. Member feels, in this case, that they may have gone wrong, then, the due process is that we have an Appellate Tribunal. We have judicial remedy—which goes by those guidelines — against that and it steps into the matter. If anybody is aggrieved in cases of this kind, — nobody has still written to us, but even if they write to us, — we are prepared to make a reference back as to whether the Censor Board guidelines have been complied with or not. Even in cases of this kind, I would only give the same reply. We have a legal process by which clearances and approvals are granted. It would be better to stay on with those guidelines. Even in this case, if the hon. Member brings to my notice, I am prepared to refer it back. But it will be the Censor Board, or, the Appellate Tribunal, which will be the final authority.

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, so far as the picture "Hey Ram" is concerned, it has now been brought to the notice of the hon. Minister and the Government. Will the Government or the hon. Minister assure this House that they will take proper steps? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI : What about "Midnight Children" which was stopped when you were Minister? *(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Santosh Bagrodia.

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: Sir, there was no answer to my question.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have already answered that question.

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, it appears that the hon.

Minister has himself admitted the fact. He says himself, "the State Government of Uttar Pradesh conveyed that there were protests by organisations and persons in Varanasi about the content of the script and suggested re-examination of the script by the Government of India". After that, it is not Ms. Deepa Mehta who wanted it. Nowhere has he mentioned that it is Ms. Deepa Mehta who approached him. Ms. Deepa Mehta approached him, but she approached him under pressure. Even then he approved it. After he approved it, the law and order question was raised. Mr. Chairman, Sir, according to them, there were only 100 or 150 people who were creating law and order problem. It appears that the U.P. Government has failed. There is no law and order in the State of U.P. Is the Government of India going to take any action against the Government of Uttar Pradesh on this issue? Or, are they just going to accept the fact that because one District Magistrate did not allow this particular film to be shot in Varanasi, the Government of India will stop the fundamental rights of every citizen of the country? This is what I would like to know from the hon. Minister.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, in so far as the question, which relates to the Government of India, is concerned, I may categorically state that there was no pressure brought on anybody to change the script. The director, who has been named, had an opportunity to meet me. I categorically told her that she was under no pressure, that we would consider the request of the State Government of U.P. as also her request in accordance with the law and that it was for her to decide it herself. She *suo motu* revised the script by making certain changes and gave it to us. I categorically deny that any pressure was brought on her.

SHRI V.P. DURAISAMY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the shooting of the film "Water" has generated a lot of heat and tension among the people. I don't know the producer and the director of the film. They are very keen to shoot the film in Varanasi, that is, in Kashi only. Already two Governments have extended their co-operation for shooting the film. In view of this, certain organisations are against shooting the film there. The Tamil Nadu Government and the Tamil Nadu people are always for freedom expression. Our Chief Minister is also a great scrip writer. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what steps the Minister will take to protect freedom of expression. Will the Government give protection to the producer and the director for further shooting of the film?

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, even when it was shot in Varanasi, the Home Ministry had advised the State Government of U.P. that adequate police protection should be given to them. That will be the stand of

the Government of India in relation to every film which is to be shot and against which there are protests.

श्री ओंकार सिंह लखावत: माननीय सभापति महोदय, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या दीपा मेहता एक विदेशी नागरिक हैं और क्योंकि वह हिन्दुस्तान में फिल्म बनाना चाहती थीं, इसलिए उसके लिए अनुमति लेना जरूरी हो गया? मेरा दूसरा प्रश्न है कि क्या इस फिल्म की जो कथा है, उसमें पवित्र गंगा को वाटर, वहां के मंदिरों में वेश्यावृत्ति के दृश्य, हिन्दू देवी-देवताओं के नारायण और भगवान राम की पत्नी जानकी नाम से संबोधन - ऐसे शब्दों का उपयोग उस कथा में उपलब्ध है या नहीं? क्या इसके पहले भारत सरकार और राज्य सरकारों ने धार्मिक भावनाओं के विपरीत होने के कारण किसी फिल्म के फिल्मांकन पर प्रतिबंध लगाया और अगर लगाया तो कब-कब लगाया?

श्री अरुण जेटली: जहां तक प्रश्न के पहले भाग का संबंध है तो यह सच है कि वह विदेशी नागरिक है और जिस कंपनी की ओर से फिल्म बन रही है, वह विदेशी कंपनी है इसलिए उसके लिए पूर्व अनुमति लेना अनिवार्य है, आवश्यक है। जहां तक प्रश्न का दूसरा भाग है, फिल्म में कुछ अंशों के संबंध में कुछ लोगों ने चर्चा की है और कुछ आवेदन भी दिए हैं हम लोगों ने उनको भी मद्दे-नजर रखा है। जब पहले हमने उनको क्लीयरेंस दी थी उस समय ये सारे आवेदन हम लोगों के सामने नहीं थे, दूसरी बार थे और जब ये फाइनल क्लीयरेंस के लिए आएंगे तो उन आवेदनों को भी हम मद्दे-नजर रखेंगे और सेंसर बोर्ड के सामने भी रख देंगे ताकि वह उसी प्रकार से उनको अनुमति दे।

जहां तक प्रश्न का तीसरा भाग है, मेरे पास अभी पूरी सूची तो नहीं है लेकिन कई बार ऐसी फिल्म जिससे किसी देश की छवि को या किसी वर्ग विशेष को या उसकी छवि को नुकसान पहुंचता हो तो इस प्रकार के प्रतिबंध लगाए गए हैं। अगर माननीय सदस्य चाहें तो इसकी पूरी सूची तैयार करके मैं उनको भिजवा दूंगा।

SHRI SHANKAR ROY CHOWDHURY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to speak on the same issue which has agitated...

MR. CHAIRMAN: No speech, please put the question.

SHRI SHANKAR ROY CHOWDHURY: Sir, I would just like to mention...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please put the question, do not make a speech.

SHRI SHANKAR ROY CHOWDHURY: Okay, Sir. I would just like to mention that 'Water' is not the first instance of such an intolerance, nor is it going to be the last instance. This will happen in future also. My question is, will the Government ensure that the freedom of expression by any section of the community is protected by force, if need be now, and in the future?

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Well, if it had been simply a protest and a peaceful protest, it would have been dealt with separately. But if the protest becomes violent or intimidatory, then it is the responsibility of all the State Governments and district administration to see to it that a protest of this kind does not lead to violence or intimidation.

DR. RAJA RAMANNA: Mr. Chairman, we have had good pictures, bad pictures but none of them have created so much discussion as to come to Parliament. My question to the hon. Minister is: are you going to do something about the widows of Banaras, which is a problem that has been existing for a long time, which is a disgrace to the nation, disgrace to Parliament. So, something must be done in this regard.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: It is a question put in the best of spirits. It is a good question, but put by a wrong person. I would certainly, in my individual capacity, do my best with regard to whatever the hon. Member has in mind.

श्री शरीफ-उद्-दीन शरीक: सर, ऑनरेबल मेंबर और ऑनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब की तरफ से इस बारे में जो सवाल-जवाब हुआ, ये सब टेक्नीकल बाते हैं। असल बात यह है कि इन बातों के पीछे फिरकापरस्ती का एक जहर काम कर रहा है। मुझे नायडु साहब का यह कहना कि मैं हिंदू के इंटरेस्ट के लिए यहां खड़ा हुआ हूं, यह वोट हासिल करने के लिए होगा लेकिन यह मुल्क के हित में नहीं है। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री एम. वेंकैया नायडु: मैंने सभी के लिए कहा।

श्री शरीफ-उद्-दीन शरीक: नहीं, बाद में इन्होंने कहा लेकिन इनके थैले से बिल्ली पहले ही बाहर आ गई। इन्होंने कहा...यहां कहा...(व्यवधान)...

श्री एम. वेंकैया नायडु: मैं हिंदू भी हूं, मुसलमान भी हूं, ब्राह्मण भी हूं...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सरीफ-उद्-दीन शरीक: मैं मानता हूं। मैं उस मुसलमान के लिए नहीं लड़ूंगा जो बदमाश है। मैं मुसलमान हूं लेकिन उस मुसलमान को मैं हिंदुस्तान के लिए लानत समझता हूं जो फिरकापरस्त है। आपको फिरकापरस्त हिंदू मुबारक हो लेकिन मैं फिरकापरस्ती को किसी सूरत में नहीं मानता हूं। ये टेक्नीकल बातें हैं। असल बात यह है कि इस मुल्क में तहरीर, तकरीर, गुफतार और सोच की आजादी रहेगी या नहीं रहेगी? क्या यह मुल्क चंद गुंडों और जुनूनियों के ताबे रहेगा या दिमागी आजादी के तहत रहेगा? ये टेक्नीकल जवाब नहीं चलेगा मिनिस्टर साहब। आप एक बार फैसला कर लीजिए कि इस मुल्क में तहरीर, तकरीर, एक्सप्रेशन की आजादी आईने हिंदुस्तान और दस्तूरे हिंद के तहत चलेगी, चंद गुंडों के मातहत नहीं चलेगी। इसलिए आपको यह गारंटी देनी पड़ेगी। टेक्नीकल बातों से काम नहीं चलेगा और सुनिए, लोगों को शर्म आनी चाहिए...(व्यवधान)... हमारी बहनें, बनारस की हमारी लड़कियां, बेटियां जो अस्मतफरोशी

के लिए मजबूर हुईं, क्या किया आप लोगों ने उनके लिए?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question hour is over.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO STARRED QUESTIONS

Unhygienic condition of canteens run by SAI

*44. SHRI E. BALANANDAN: Will the Minister of YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether attention of Government has been drawn to the fact that food supplied to sportsmen and women at the canteens run by the Sports Authority of India (SAI) is unfit for human consumption and the kitchens are not hygienic there;

(b) whether Government have conducted any enquiry into these allegations;

(c) if so, what are the findings of the enquiry and the steps taken to improve the situation; and

(d) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS (SHRI SUKHDEV SINGH DHINDSA): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) to (d) The Government has received a complaint in this regard and is enquiring into the matter. Remedial measures will be taken as required.

Sale of Part Equity of IPCL

*45. SHRI V. N. GADGIL: Will the Minister of DISINVESTMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to sell 25 per cent of the equity of the PSU Navratna IPCL; and

(b) the reasons as to why Government propose to hand over its management to strategic partner DOW chemicals, or Mitsubishi or Reliance Industries or George Soros-Chatterjee group when it is a pioneer in frontier technology and has reserves of Rs. 2771 crores as against equity of Rs. 249 crores?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DISINVESTMENT (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The proposed disinvestment in IPCL is in line with the declared